



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/642,285	08/18/2003	Satoshi Sakamaki	1259-0236P	2455
2292	7590	03/14/2006		EXAMINER
		BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747		FINEMAN, LEE A
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2872	

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

5K

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/642,285	SAKAMAKI, SATOSHI
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Lee Fineman	2872

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 January 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 5 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 8/18/03 & 4/11/05 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to the remarks filed 6 January 2005. Claims 1-10 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-4 and 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tachibana et al., US 6,731,357 B1.

Tachibana et al. disclose in fig. 1 a polarizing filter comprising a polarizing film (1); a first protective film (2) adhered to one surface of said polarizing film (fig. 1); and a second protective film (2) adhered to another surface of said polarizing film (fig. 1), said second protective film being different in at least one of thickness, physical properties or materials (at least in so far as the thicknesses of the two films will be different due to the disclosed variation in film thickness during manufacture; see column 7, lines 46-51); wherein when M1 is a coefficient of expansion by water absorption of said first protective film in a direction of a light absorption axis of said polarizing filter and M2 is a coefficient of expansion by water absorption of said second protective film in a direction of a light absorption axis of said polarizing filter, then the coefficients of expansion M1 and M2 satisfy a formula; $0.85 M1 < M2 < 1.20 M1$ (in so far

as the films are the same material and therefore have the same coefficients of expansion, and when $M1=M2$, the condition is satisfied); the coefficients of expansion $M1$ and $M2$ being larger than 0.02 (column 5, lines 43-46); the difference in thickness between said first and second protective films being more than $2\mu\text{m}$ and less than $100\mu\text{m}$ (column 7, lines 46-51, at least in so far as when $60\mu\text{m}$ films differ $\pm 3\%$, the difference will be $3.6\mu\text{m}$); wherein said polarized film is polyvinylalcohol series (column 10, lines 50-51); wherein said first and second protective films are adhered to said polarized film with an adhesive agent (column 10, lines 55-59); and wherein at least one of the protective films is cellulose acylate (column 10, line 56). The method of utilizing the structure of the claim is inherent therein.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claim 5 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 5 has allowable subject matter over the prior art for at least the reasons stated in the office action mailed 11 October 2005.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 6 January 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

First, the applicant argues that the examiner is misinterpreting the teachings of Tachibana et al. because the variance in thickness disclosed is referring to manufacturing variations in

thickness across a single sheet of protective film and not a total variation in thickness between the films on either side of the polarizing films (see remarks, page 2, paragraph 4). The examiner respectfully disagrees and would like to point out that two parts of a single sheet are used to make the polarizing plate of fig. 1 (see example 1, column 10, line (55-57). Therefore, a manufacturing variation of $\pm 3\%$ within this sheet will cause a thickness variation/difference between the protective films (each part) used on the polarizing plate. This variation meets the claimed limitation of the second protective film being different from the first protective film in thickness.

Secondly, the applicant argues that the condition of $M1=M2$ is not necessarily satisfied by the reference as stated by the examiner because the coefficients of expansion of water of two protective films are not always the same even if they are made from the same material but vary in thickness and points to the example of Polymer Films C and D of the specification. The examiner respectfully disagrees and believes that the applicant is not taking into consideration whether the manufacturing process is the same for both films (it is clearly the same in Tachibana et al. because it is made as a single sheet). In the instant application the manufacturing process of Polymer Films C and D is very broadly recited as the same, but the examiner questions this evidence because it fails to disclose how two very different thicknesses ($80\mu\text{m}$ vs. $108\mu\text{m}$) are made with exactly the same process. Therefore, it is still the examiner's position that the two pieces in Tachibana et al. of the same material made by the same process will have equal coefficients of expansion ($M1=M2$) and therefore satisfy the formula; $0.65 M1 < M2 < 1.55 M1$ as claimed.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lee Fineman whose telephone number is (571) 272-2313. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Drew Dunn can be reached on (571) 272-2312. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



LAF
March 8, 2006



MARK A. ROBINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER